



NB There are two comments submitted separately by a married couple John and Mark who live at [redacted] and are carrying out a very similar building project including an underground heating system. Both 99 and 101 are new residents of South end road, who started massive extensive building works, some of them without obtaining planning permission. If every member of the household is entitled to a comment each, then please count this as a summation of 5 comments, each made by members of my family.

**Response to Mrs Rosenfeld'** comment - we are direct neighbour of n99 semidetached - No, we have not experienced a flood. N99 removed all the cement/concrete protection around the house, which the previous owner installed. Removing the enormous amount of concrete, by the method of pneumatic drilling for several months, was made without the council's knowledge and noise committee's approval/regulation. Over the last 4 years, there has only been one rain storm, and no damage came as a result of it. [However, because flow](#) change of the underground water, due to the works carried out, n97 constantly had wet wall, which has not been an issue at least since the 1970s.

**Response to Mr Fiertag'** "Dismantling and disposing of the structure currently present would be a waste of resources and energy." Comment.  
The Council was aware of the unconsented changes/buildings in April, as was the owner of n99. If the question of "waste of resources and energy" was a real concern, then no work could be done without obtaining the consent prior. If we follow such an approach, where it's "too much energy and resource" to dismantle something that was erected without permission, then it would deem the "conservation area" pointless, as most residents would only seek permission retroactively.

Dear Sirs,

I am the owner of [redacted] and am a direct neighbour of [redacted] for which there is a pending Retrospective planning application. I am sending you a copy of my objection at the same time as making it online, just in case anything goes wrong with the online objection. I had no objection to the application they made before in the first instance, but I do have important concerns in relation to my neighbour's changed plan which I have tried to raise with her in a friendly fashion in April this year when I noticed they carried out unconsented work. Unfortunately, I have not had a substantive response.

**1. The Proposed and already built without consent raised parking platform and enlargement of utility shed all over the frontage of the front garden. of No. 99:**

Nos 97 and 99 South End Road form part of a row of houses running along the floor of a dried-up river valley. The valley curves North West and rises in level from 77 South End Road to where the valley floor crosses Downshire Hill.

Anyone walking along South End Road could not help but notice the very pleasant, almost rural view afforded by the valley and the row of houses along it. It offers a glimpse of a bygone age. Or at least it did, before no99 erected the carpark platform for which they now seek retroactive planning permission and the large shed next to it. Both the platform and the shed are entirely out of character with the surrounding properties (and their gardens). Both should be entirely removed from 99's road-facing garden. They have also set up an underground heating system including machinery right next to the border of 97, again without a consultation or application process, which causes a lot of noise and disturbance.

Not only is the parking platform an eyesore, it has already contributed to a lot of inconvenience during its construction (large amount of concrete initially erected to tackle flooding in the N99 driveway and rear garden had to be broken down with a pneumatic drill, which was not arranged with the noise regulation committee). In addition to this, it has devalued my property, as you can now see cars and massive utilities shed from the garden and our windows at eye level (and can also hear the underground heating system). In the initial application, which was approved for no 99, there was a reference to a parking place for one small city car. Instead, now there is room for 3 city cars or two full size cars. There is slope parking everywhere else on the street, which is far more inoffensive and fits in with the aesthetic of the area.

The raised platform was built without any prior consultation with the Council or the neighbouring n97 (which is a property attached to no99). Moreover, when n97 asked about these works at the beginning, in April 2022, there was no response from n99. When n97 contacted Camden Council, Mr Bakall said that it was very hard for non-technical people to read technical drawings, so the owner of no97 could not be expected to read drawings properly, which is already an assumption. *This means that there has been no sufficient documentation to provide evidence for why a platform is needed to cover cannisters or why there were no alternative method as flood prevention.*

If no 99's explanation for installing all of this as a measure for flood protection is satisfactory to the Council, then as I understand it means that the whole road is now able to set up such anti-flood systems, erecting parking platforms for the space of 3 cars. How many of the houses on South End Road and in the area face flooding as a threat? None of them however are building parking platforms. When buying the 99 property, I am sure the owners were aware that this is a conservation area and it was a listed building. The reasoning in the retroactive planning permission and the justification of the specific implementation of the parking platform both seem bogus. As noted in the application, the soil is London clay and

one cannot avoid this merely by burying some plastic crates in it. The crates will collect rainwater until they are full but the rainwater still has to go somewhere.

If n99 are really concerned about optimising their drainage system, they don't seem very serious about it, as 97's rear garden has been flooded 3 times with n99 sewage (faeces), who have not apologised for this. Therefore, it does not seem very believable that the work that they are doing is to "improve" precautions against flooding. Moreover, according to their words, they had already set up a water drainage tank system around the house in 2021. Therefore, I am not quite sure why they need to systems now, both around the house and in the front. It doesn't make sense and makes me question their justification for what they have built.

Moreover, during the building works, many of the plants on the side on 97 were destroyed and the fence which had ivy growing on it, was broken and disposed of. Soil, stones and clay ended up sliding down from n99 to n97 and continue to do so as there is still no sufficient fence and retaining wall (despite multiple requests). In addition to destroying our plants, n99 also cut down their own tree without permission, ruining the scenic surroundings even more. To this current day, there is no fence but just building palettes that are being used as a substitute.

N97 requested Mr Sorrell (primary builder) to restore the fence and build a retaining wall to avoid things sliding in to n97. This was not addressed.

The owner of number 99 has also evidently chosen deliberately to disregard the English convention of sheds being located in the back garden, by erecting a large shed in front of the house, indeed on the very edge of the property as viewed from South End Road. This is a prominent eyesore and is inconsistent with the other houses in the row, which have their sheds and outbuildings at the rear of the house. They have put some greenery around the newly erected shed; however, this does not conceal it.

N99 consists of two 3 storey dwellings and two gardens. They demolished shed in the rear garden to be able to put a new one in front garden?

We completely object to the raised platform and request for it to be taken down, leaving the original slope profile as all the other South End Road properties have as viewed from the road. Overall, the construction of the parking platform imparts an unmistakable "in your face" impression of the platform itself and of any cars parked upon it.

The huge shed must be relocated from the front line of the front garden. See how all the other properties on the street cope with bins and bicycles and show respect to public. In addition to this, the newly installed underground heating system above ground ventilation is a great concern for us due to the noise.

We also would like to request reimbursement for all the damages incurred on n 97 through the works done by 99.

If the car platform and shed are permitted, it sets a precedent for all the other houses in South End Road to do likewise. I am not saying that they should be allowed to follow the precedent, I am just pointing up the absurdity of giving serious consideration to what 99 are seeking in the planning application. Neither the car platform nor the shed should be permitted; both should be demolished and all traces of them should be removed.

### **3. The erection of chimney on the terrace – application was never served.**

No. 99 has a roof terrace at first floor level as part of an annex/coach house which has been there for many years (probably circa 1920s/1930s). This is an external seating area which faces the sun for most of the day and it provides a considerable amenity for outside seating when the weather permits, particularly as much of the rear garden is quite sheltered from the sun for certain parts of the day. It is on the boundary with No. 97 and directly at the level of bedrooms and the living room. An unconsented chimney has been built there by No 99.

No. 97, therefore, will inevitably be affected by the steam and combustion gases from this chimney. It will affect both the air quality and overall amenity of No 97, regardless of what fuel is intended to be used. It is evident from the drawing of the proposed terrace that there was no intention to build this. It would be far preferable for the chimney to be demolished. N99 has at least 4-6 fire places and chimneys on the roof of the main dwelling.

### **4. Noise at the rear garden by fountain**

The terraced houses of South End Road are characterised by their open front gardens which are available for the public to view as they pass by and, in

juxtaposition, their intimate and peaceful, private (albeit small) rear gardens which take on a particular importance for the residents.

This will no longer be possible because of a water feature which works 24/7, in all types of weather, during the periods when I and other neighbours would like to quietly enjoy our rear gardens. Moreover, this noise prevents n97 to open the windows to enjoy fresh air at night time. The noise issue will further be exacerbated by the enclosed nature of the rear gardens where sound will reverberate off the rear elevations of the terraced houses, and among the tightly enclosed rear gardens.

**5. Damages to borders, fence, leakage, plants, drainage must be reimbursed, stone retaining wall must be erected to stop soil sliding down.**

N97 comments are very similar to that of n99 (their response to our planning application). We appear to share the same values of quietness, tranquillity and deep respect for historical heritage. However, the owner of 99 operates blatant double standards when it comes to making changes to the gardens in South End Road. On the one hand, she objected to a water bicycle because the noise created by people using it would disturb her in her back garden. On the other hand, she is evidently happy for the noise from the heater, that is operating 24/7, to disturb n97 and passers-by on South End Road because it is out of her earshot. Same applies to the water feature.

Often sound can be used as a method of torture; i.e. the dripping tap. You are not able to control it, and it causes you physical stress. One can develop chronic physical symptoms. Therefore, it is not an exaggeration to say that our lives have been ruined by the terrible noise we have experienced over the last 2.5 years from the construction work and now the constant noise in our front and back garden.

Since 2000, the World Health Organisation has recognised noise as an environmental problem that causes various health impacts.

N97 cannot even let the property at an adequate price because it has decreased in value due to all this work that has been carried out and noise.













The picture of the only one modest shed on the South end road build without consent and n99 shed.





The picture shows the way of parking on the South end road: historically and at n99.



This was installed on the boarder on n97 and South end road.



Damage to n97 during the works at n99























Your fence boarder is exactly where you had installed white/green construction sheet/fence. Greens/trees at the front are on my land. You must restore the fence on the line of old bricks/stone. You must build STONE retaining wall to hold your raised ground level, remove your cement/sand/soil from my garden and replace damaged plants. You must remove concrete/timber structure at the front from my land immedeatly.

